

### Remarks

Applicants appreciate the recognition of allowable subject matter in the present application. Applicants respectfully submit this response to request reconsideration of the rejections of the claims in consideration of the following remarks.

Claims 9, 10, 12, 18, 19, 22-25, 29, 30, 40-43, 45, and 47 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) for anticipation by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0024586 A1 to Nakatsuka et al. Claims 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28 and 46 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) for anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 5,986,687 to Hori. Claims 11 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) for obviousness over Nakatsuka in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,198,497 to Luque.

Independent claim 9 recites a *control system configured to maintain the light source at a constant drive level during scanning of a single line of information on the photoconductor*.

The Office relies upon the teachings of Fig. 2 and paragraphs 0068-0072 of Nakatsuka as teaching the above-recited limitations. Applicants have failed to uncover any disclosure in these teachings of the claimed control system configured to maintain the light source at a constant drive level during scanning of the single line of information. To the contrary, these teachings disclose a light output power  $P_N$  of a plurality of laser power levels for multiple density printing. In addition, paragraph 0067 teaches the *driving current of the laser is controlled by a varying power level data signal so that printing dots of different sizes may be implemented* which fails to disclose the claimed limitations and teaches away from the above-recited limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of independent claim 9 are not disclosed nor suggested by Nakatsuka and the rejection is in error for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

Referring to independent claim 14, the Office relies upon the teachings of col. 4, lines 58+ and col. 5, lines 16+ of Hori as teaching the claimed *control system configured to receive an indication of the sampled single light beam from the photodetector and to maintain a drive level of the laser at a constant drive level during scanning of the line of information onto the photoconductor using the*

*indication of the sampled single light beam.*

However, the teachings in col. 4, lines 58+ of Hori disclose that imperfections in reflective surfaces of the polygonal mirror will result in different intensities of light reflected to the photoconductor and fails to teach provide any teachings regarding maintaining the drive level of a laser constant. These teachings disclose control of the drive current to the laser diode LD in accordance with a comparison voltage output and fail to teach maintaining a drive level of the laser constant. To the contrary of the claimed limitations, Hori explicitly discloses varying the drive level of the laser diode. In particular, Applicants refer to col. 6, lines 40+ which provide that the laser drive circuit 17 controls the laser diode LD to produce an increased laser power as shown by line (c) in Fig. 3. Furthermore, the laser diode can also be driven by a control signal to output light at reduced power levels per line (c) of Fig. 3.

Applicants respectfully submit the explicit teachings of Hori of varying the drive level of the laser diode and providing varied laser power during the scanning of one line per Fig. 3 fails to teach the limitations of the control system configured to maintain a drive level of the laser at a constant drive level during scanning of the line of information onto the photoconductor.

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of independent claim 14 are not disclosed nor suggested by Hori and the rejection is in error for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

Referring to independent claim 18, Nakatsuka at paragraph 0067 teaches the driving current of the laser is controlled by a varying power level data signal so that printing dots of different sizes may be implemented. Hori discloses varying the driving of the laser diode LD per col. 6, lines 40+ which provides that the laser drive circuit 17 controls the laser diode LD to produce different laser powers as shown by line (c) in Fig. 3. Applicants respectfully submit that Nakatsuka and Hori fail to disclose the claimed limitations of means for generating a single light beam in combination with the means for maintaining the means for generating at a constant drive level during scanning of the line of information onto the photoconductor.

Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of independent claim 18 are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the

rejections are in error for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections.

Referring to independent claim 22, the claim recites limitations of previously pending claim 25 which was rejected under 102 over Nakatsuka. However, Nakatsuka at paragraph 0067 teaches the *driving current of the laser is controlled by a varying power level data signal so that printing dots of different sizes may be implemented* which fails to disclose the claimed limitations of *maintaining an output power of the light source at a constant level during writing of a single scan line of information onto the photoconductor.*


Applicants respectfully submit that positively-recited limitations of independent claim 22 are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and the rejections are in error for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

The claims which depend from the independent claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the respective independent claims as well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the cited art.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours (Pacific Time Zone).

Respectfully submitted,  
William D. Holland

By:   
James D. Shaurette  
Reg. No. 39,833  
Date: 12/12/08  
(509) 624-4276